

# **P2 Innovative Coatings and Coating Equipment Stakeholder Meeting Minutes for May 6, 1998**

## **SUMMARY OF MINUTES**

### **ETV STAKEHOLDER MEETING**

#### **ORGANIC COATINGS AND APPLICATION EQUIPMENT**

**U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC; May 6, 1998**

#### **Status**

Brian Schweitzer opened the meeting and stressed that the focus of the meeting is to confirm the path forward for the program. Mike Kosusko presented an update of the overall ETV program, including a summary of goals and principles and a list of accomplishments to date. Comments were made about efficient protocol development to hasten technology implementation and the EPA's long term role. Stakeholders agreed that regulators place more value on things signed by the EPA; therefore, EPA should stay involved long term. Brian Schweitzer followed with a presentation on the ETV CCEP status and accomplishments to date. Quality, robustness, and variability of the tested technologies should be mentioned qualitatively in the verification statements, according to some stakeholders. Different operators may affect the technology performance. By removing the operator from verification testing and relying on automation, aesthetic and ergonomic factors that may affect performance are not addressed. However, the program emphasizes environmental concerns while maintaining quality, so effort must be placed on achievable performance levels, while leaving more subjective areas to the user's discretion. Smaller vendors may have more difficulty participating in the program, due to its associated costs.

#### **HVLP**

After general discussions about the ETV CCEP program, Rob Fisher presented and led discussions on the testing of High Volume, Low Pressure (HVLP) spray guns. A summary of the comments follows.

Transfer efficiency data should be able to be obtained through paint usage, disposal, and production records kept by users. However, the environmental benefit of this technology will still be verified by making comparisons between conventional and HVLP gun transfer efficiencies. During Conventional Air Spray (CAS) gun testing, the CAS guns will be run at the lowest pressure that meets quality standards in order to achieve the best

transfer efficiencies for the guns. Reference panels will be available from coating vendors to compare test coating to a standard. This will be included in the protocol. The test cap pressure (10 psig for HVLP) could be affected by the test port location. Test port locations may have to be drilled to the same place on each HVLP gun. A defined viscosity range was suggested for the protocol, but viscosity should not be another restriction for vendors. Viscosity will be reported, however, after testing. A range of conditions should be verified for the HVLP guns, using one coating as a starting point for testing, but cost and time factors are difficult to overcome. Comments about ergonomics were made, but the program must focus on environmental concerns while maintaining quality. The end user must be relied upon to complete the evaluation of the guns for purchase.

### **Innovative Technologies**

The Powder and UV-Curable Coatings Protocols were not readily accepted by industry because the manufacturers did not identify a substantial benefit from the program. They believed their research and their success penetrating the market provided the credibility needed to continue gains in market share. Ms. Hendrick stated that she understood the reluctance of the powder industry to participate in the ETV CCEP because of the highly specialized nature of powder coating formulations for each customer and also because of basic economics. She went on to point out that another possible reason for hesitation among vendors to participate in the program is that they need to see the impact of a verification statement. When verification statements make it into the public domain, the vendors will be in a position to evaluate the value of a verification statement for themselves and may be more willing to participate.

For the current solicitation, ETV CCEP personnel developed an approach that allowed a much wider range of products to be evaluated, thus allowing truly innovative technologies to benefit from the program. The initial group of solicitations for the new Innovative Technologies focus area has been mailed to vendors. After ETV CCEP personnel create a list of candidates, the stakeholders will be asked for assistance in prioritizing the technologies. The solicitation and Commerce Business Daily announcement will be sent to stakeholders. Concern was noted that vendors might not be fully aware of the criteria that will be used to prioritize the candidates for testing. Discussion revealed the following list to determine the order of testing of innovative technologies.

- Viable product (technically feasible)
- Potential environmental impact
- Size of potential marketplace
- Cost and time of testing (groups of products available)
- Commercially available
- Owned by provider (not limited to US companies)
- Impact beyond MACT floor (regulatory drivers)

- Compatibility with an existing protocol
- Implementation issues (cost, logistics, etc.)
- Focus on environmental claims
- Value of verification statement

Some of the suggested types of technologies are:

- Laser guided spray guns
- Powder reclamation systems for large equipment coating operations
- UV-curable pigmented coatings
- Nonconductive substrates, particularly for powder coatings
- Coil coatings (simulated wood grain)

Ideas for new focus areas should be forwarded to Brian Schweitzer. If one vendor submits a product, will a new focus area be formed if the product falls within a group of similar technologies? Unsolicited products will be reviewed against existing solicitations.

EPA Method 24 was designed for solvent based paints with high VOC. The method is being called into question more and more with newer coatings. A new method is needed, particularly to address more advanced products that will fall into "Innovative Technologies" and new focus areas.

Next meetings:

- 4th Stakeholder Meeting = Oct - Nov, 1998 (Not Oct. 14-16 or Nov. 2-6)
- 5th Stakeholder Meeting = Sept 21-23, 1999, Dallas, Finishing Conference

## **List Of Attendees**

### **ETV CCEP Stakeholders**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Loren Anderson	Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Patricia Hendrick	AFP, a Division of the Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME)
Carl Izzo	Consultant
William Johnson	US EPA/OAQPS
Rick Klein	Iowa Waste Reduction Center - University of Northern Iowa
Mike Kosusko	US EPA/NRMRL

Larry Melgary	CCAI
Eugene Praschan	American Automobile Manufacturers Association (AAMA) and ASTM
Dave Salman	US EPA/OAQPS
Brian Schweitzer	CTC
Shirley Wasson	US EPA/NRMRL
Mark Wayner	PA Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP)
John Flynn	PPG Industries
David Williams	NC DPPEA

### **Observers**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Affiliation</u></b>
Robert Fisher	CTC
Larry Jones	US EPA/NRMRL
Charles Masser	US EPA/NRMRL
Geddes Ramsey	US EPA/NRMRL
Mohamed Serageldin	US EPA/OAQPS
Dean Smith	US EPA/NRMRL
Chet Vogel	US EPA/NRMRL
Chris White	MTS Technologies
Steve Williams	ICF Kaiser International